

United States District Court
Eastern District of California

William Lee Wright,

Petitioner,

vs.

Edward S. Alameida, Jr.,
et al.,

Respondents.

No. Civ. S 03-0430 FCD PAN P

Findings and Recommendations

-oOo-

March 18, 2005, an order served on petitioner was returned by the postal service as undeliverable. Petitioner has failed to comply with Local Rule 83-182(d), which requires that a party appearing pro se inform the court of any address change.

Accordingly, the court hereby recommends that this action be dismissed without prejudice. L.R. 83-183(b) (dismissal appropriate where pro se plaintiff fails to notify court of current address within 60 days of return of mail by U.S. Postal Service).

1 Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), these
2 findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States
3 District Judge assigned to this case. Written objections may be
4 filed within 20 days of service of these findings and
5 recommendations. The document should be captioned "Objections to
6 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The district
7 judge may accept, reject, or modify these findings and
8 recommendations in whole or in part.

9 Dated: June 2, 2005.

10 _____
11 /s/ Peter A. Nowinski
12 PETER A. NOWINSKI
13 Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26